USACE After Action Review MSC/District Feedback

7-8 June 2011

US Army Corps of Engineers
BUILDING STRONG®

LRD

PDR/3086 Process Feedback {LRD/LRL}

- Items that worked well
  - Constant Management focus and visibility
  - All PM's for projects at one installation coordinated amongst themselves to minimize impact to installation and streamline LRL execution (use same A-Es, combine meetings, etc.)
  - Weekly Phonecons with HNC and HQUSACE
  - New PDRS website for input of data/info
- Items that need improvement
  - Seemed like we had to repeat the same background history many weeks during phonecons; wasted time
  - Lost track of ongoing status after 3086's were submitted. Tracking of 3086 process at GD by PM element was virtually non-existent, even though discussions were ongoing between HNC and GD Cost Engineers.

PDR/3086 Process Feedback
{LRD/LRL}

- Strategies employed that facilitated success
  - Had single supervisor overseeing all project actions in District; maintained constant visibility and focused priority within LRL
  - Used A-E IDIQ Task Orders to expedite PDR preparation, combined meetings to minimize impact to installation elements (DPW, unit, Env, Phys Sec, NEC, etc.)
  - Maintained constant coordination and communication among GD PM's, DPW Master Plans POC's, A-E's and Cost Engineers throughout entire process
  - Included ongoing status of PDR/3086 execution in monthly PRB's with senior district leadership

NAD

PDR/3086 Process Feedback
NAD

- Items that worked well
  - Weekly teleconferences with HQ and Division: provided time for discussion, guidance and resolution
  - PDR reviewer responses: timely and excellent quality
  - Correspondence between HNC and District cost estimators
  - PDRS Wizard: streamlined PDR submission process
  - Process: focus first on PDR, then ENG3086

PDR/3086 Process Feedback
NAD

- Items that need improvement
  - 3086 communication between HNC/District estimators and PMs and HQ: propose increasing it to PDR Teleconference level
  - PDR Lite Template: propose it records all items required in PDRS Checklist (e.g. LEED Checklist, FF&E validation and a Scope Table)
  - COS reviews: propose reviews are included in PDRS vs e-mails/PAX for sake of efficiency

PDR/3086 Process Feedback
NAD

- IMCOM Region/Garrison/ACSIM/USACE communication
- Timing of guidance (try to do before PDR process starts or early as possible)
- Code Releases
  - Earlier release of Code 1s and 3s
  - For Europe, issue Code 2s (DBB) vs 3s (streamlines design

  Because lines up with German Gov't's process)

PDR/3086 Process Feedback
NAD

- Strategies employed that facilitated success
  - District Cost Engineering involvement during Design Charrette enabled them to gather detail needed for thorough 3086 submittals, e.g. Scope Table if quantities change for scope discrepancies
  - Having one “PDR Reviewer” for each project

NWD

BUILDING STRONG®

PDR/3086 Process Feedback Northwestern Division

- Items that worked well
  - Early release of some projects
  - Timely response of HNC review team
  - HNC reviewers were helpful to PMs and Cost Engineers in navigating requirements
  - Option to use PDR-Lite when appropriate
  - District use of designated PMs
  - Open and constant communication between GD and CoS

PDR/3086 Process Feedback Northwestern Division

- Items that need improvement
  - Rethink schedules or PDR/3086 execution, especially for late releases
    - Don’t assume Districts can start work immediately, especially for Aug/Sep releases
  - Chronic return of PDR for minor revisions – re-evaluate training requirements
    - Match scope of DD1391 to PDR to wizard
    - Provide clarification of furniture/equipment cost documentation
    - Early input of acquisition strategy (not at end of process)
    - Clarify whether Tab B info is included in PDR or ENG3086
    - Provide guidance on energy initiatives (acceptable percentage/specific justification)
    - How thorough/detailed should PDRs be (many are reduced later)?
    - Improve communications between GD and HNC prior to submittal
  - Acquisition strategy requirement should be more flexible (2 years out)
    - Clarify where in the process the acquisition strategy should be locked
    - GD efforts to adjust acquisition strategy trumped by CoS/coordinate strategy with CoS

PDR/3086 Process Feedback Northwestern Division

- Items that need improvement
  - Additional coordination on status of ENG3086/inform District PM of approval
  - Baseline DD1391s must be provided to all team members for clear understanding of project scope
    - Identify scope discrepancies early/address with ACSIM in timely manner
  - Districts should schedule design charrettes not later than September
  - Earlier design code releases (CD 1 is helpful and CD 3 preferred)
  - Establish dedicated District PDR PDTs
  - Clarify role of CoS approval in PDR
  - Area Cost Factor does not reflect true market conditions for NWS
  - Weekly calls required?
  - Evaluate the decisions/products of previous AARs
  - Multi-facility projects presented challenges

PDR/3086 Process Feedback Northwestern Division

- Strategies employed that facilitated success
  - Early engagement of Cost Engineering
  - District communication/coordination with HNC reviewers
  - Regional support offered more flexibility to Districts
  - Early identification of project workload to determine AE or IH support requirements
  - Training improves execution

POD

PDR/3086 Process Feedback
Pacific Ocean Division

- Items that worked well
  - Weekly teleconferences and spreadsheet
    - Visibility of project status
    - Open dialogue between all parties; strengthen working relationships
  - PDRS Wizard
    - Ease of submitting and tracking PDRs and supplemental data/documents
    - Automatic notification of project submissions and approvals
    - PDR checklist is a useful tool for the preparer
  - CoS review and approval process benefits standard design projects
  - HNC and CoS teams responsive once engaged

PDR/3086 Process Feedback
Pacific Ocean Division

- Items that need improvement
  - Phased concept ineffective for projects requiring extensive coordination; PDRI score may be more valid
  - Code release to meet GD battle rhythm
    - Release Code 1 early to allow sufficient time for project initiation and formulate of the PDT
    - Release Code 3 and PDR guidance prior to 31 August to support PDR Charrettes
  - Provide clear and concise directive instructions
    - Submission dates were not reflective of late code release
    - Not clear if full or lite PDR package is required
    - Special instructions were not coordinated with reviewers
    - Older instructions not removed or dated

PDR/3086 Process Feedback
Pacific Ocean Division

- Items that need improvement
  - PDRS Wizard
    - Reviewers not always aware/notified PDR was submitted or supplemental data/documents was uploaded
    - No notification when project status changed
    - PDR locks when a scope discrepancy is identified; other task can be accomplished while the discrepancy is being resolved
  - 3086 process
    - Guidance released after the 3086 was submitted
    - No notification of submittals and approvals
    - Limited dialogue on the weekly updates
    - Items that need improvement
  - Acquisition strategy timeline not supported

PDR/3086 Process Feedback
Pacific Ocean Division

- Items that need improvement
  - Incorporation of energy enhancing measures
    - Guidance released as 3086s were being completed; confusion if GD should comply
    - Not clear if a life cycle cost analysis is required for enhancements >1% of the primary facility cost
  - Validate availability of site/region specific standard designs
  - ATFP cost validation hindered by reviewers not aware of guidance to support
  - Integrating end user comments after PDR/3086 is reviewed or approved; potential impact to scope

PDR/3086 Process Feedback
Pacific Ocean Division

- Items that need improvement
  - Timeliness of CoS and HNC support
    - GD suspense of PDR package needed to be better coordinated with HNC/CoS review schedules
    - PDR and PAX SOWs not in agreement
    - CoS agreement with GD execution strategy
    - HNC cost validation of furniture and equipment; 1391 template needs updating
  - PC and PDR/3086 processes not integrated
    - GD needs to be involved with the 1391 preparation process
    - PC notes and minutes should be made available to all preparers
    - A/E lead PCs should include GD cost engineers; impacts supporting facility costs
    - Confusion on project title

PDR/3086 Process Feedback
Pacific Ocean Division

- Strategies employed that facilitated success
  - ► Weekly teleconferences promoted open dialogue between HQ, MSC and GD teams
  - ► PDRS Wizard
    - Automatic notification of project submittals and approvals
    - Easy access to PDR and supplemental data/documents
  - ► HNC and CoS teams support to the GD
  - ► GD leaning forward to meet target suspense dates

SAD

PDR/3086 Process Feedback
SAD

- Items that worked well
  - PDRS Wizard
  - Having an AE running the PC
  - Getting the User and DPW participation early in the process
  - Weekly update teleconference calls, RIT attendance helpful
  - Early Directives

- Items that need improvement con't
  - IMCOM Site Approvals, Environmental clearances and other action not under control of the District.
  - Need more frequent unsolicited feedback after 3086's have been submitted, regarding status of approvals.
  - There was an 8 day delay between when the 3086 was entered in the PAX and when it was considered "Submitted"
  - Change of cost indices after initiation of the 3086 resulted in re-work and delay of submittal.

- Items that need improvement con't
  - Suggest training for use of software. Seemed to be some confusion early on concerning Work Item, Labor, and Travel Codes.
- Items the need improvement
  - More funds for GD PM and the Project A/E to attend coordination meetings.

PDR/3086 Process Feedback
SAD

- Strategies employed that facilitated success
  - Weekly PDR teleconference calls.
  - Geographic District PDT meetings.
  - Getting the decision maker to the PDT meetings.

SPD

BUILDING STRONG®

PDR/3086 Process Feedback
South Pacific Division

- Items that worked well
  - Weekly teleconference updates
  - Earlier release of Code 3 Design Directives
  - Good support from reviewers for concise and direct comments
- Items that need improvement
  - Training needed for PMs, DPW staff, designers, estimators, etc., who have not gone through this process before. Just reading the "Instructions for Parametric Design (Code 3) FYxx PDR 3086" is not sufficient

PDR/3086 Process Feedback
South Pacific Division

- Continue
  - Changes to the 3086 by ACSIM should be made earlier in the process
  - Recommend the Installation Master Planner be invited to be on the monthly teleconferences

SWD

BUILDING STRONG®

PDR/3086 Process Feedback
SWD

SWF PDR POC Debra Castens
SWF ENG3086 POC Milton Schmidt
SWD VM/E POC Loc Nguyen

- Items that worked well
  - The PDR system as a whole worked well.
  - PDRS Website Checklist is user friendly and ensures all items are identified
  - Weekly Teleconferences to discuss PDR status & any issues
  - Good feedback from PDR Reviewers, COS, HNC
  - Staggered receipt of code 3's
  - Liked the "Lite" process

- Items that need improvement
  - Clear guidance on procedures, schedule/metrics, discrepancy between the PA and the DD1391.
  - Implementing ECB 2011-1
  - How DDC costs are not accounted for in the PA
  - To ensure the projects meet the VM/E requirement, the VM/E funding amount needs to be identified as a separate line item and VM/E coverage should be addressed in the PDR and check list
  - Identify the extra fee for set aside disadvantaged contractors, either sole or small contractors in the PDR and captured in PA.

PDR/3086 Process Feedback
SWD
SWF PDR POC Debra Castens
SWF ENG3086 POC Milton Schmidt

- Strategies employed that facilitated success
  - Communication /Coordination
  - Having all Stakeholders present during PDR Workshop process

DD1391 Feedback
SWD
SWF POC Eddie Murphy

- Items that need improvement
  - Will OACSIM be releasing a list of projects requiring Planning Charrettes with funding this FY?
  - Will the geographic districts have a choice to do them?

HQUSACE MSC/District Feedback Summary

PDR/3086 recap – MSC Feedback

- Items that worked well
  - Weekly teleconferences and spreadsheet (5x)
  - Earlier release of Code 3 Design Directives (4x)
  - Good support from reviewers for being timely, concise and direct comments (3x)
  - Use of PDRS Wizard (3x)
  - Correspondence between HNC and District cost estimators (2x)
  - Option to use PDR-lite (2x)

PDR/3086 recap… cont'd.

- Items that worked well
  - Getting the User and DPW participation early in the process
  - Process: focus first on PDR, then ENG3086
  - CoS review and approval process benefits standard design projects
  - District use of designated PMs
  - Open communication between GD and COS

PDR/3086 recap… cont'd.

- Items that worked well
  - Constant Management focus and visibility
  - All PM's for projects at one installation coordinated amongst themselves to minimize impact to installation and streamline LRL execution (use same A-Es, combine meetings, etc.)
  - Staggered receipt of code 3

PDR/3086 recap….cont'd

- Items that need improvement
  - Phased concept ineffective for projects requiring extensive coordination; PDRI score may be more valid
  - Code release to meet GD battle rhythm
  - Provide clear and concise directive instructions
  - PDRS Wizard – notification/locks at scope discrepancy
  - 3086 Process – timeliness of guidance and PAX newsletter, more dialogue, notification
  - Acquisition strategy (2x)
  - Training for PDT (3x)

PDR/3086 recap….cont'd

- Items that need improvement
  - Guidance for energy enhancing measures
  - Availability of site/region specific standard designs
  - ATFP cost validation by reviewers not aware of guidance to support
  - Integrating end user comments after PDR/3086 is reviewed or approved
  - Timeliness of CoS and HNC support
  - PC and PDR/3086 processes not integrated
  - DD1391 version to use

PDR/3086 recap….cont'd

- Items that need improvement
  - Changes to the 3086 by ACSIM should be made earlier in the process
  - Invite Installation Master Planner at teleconferences
  - 3086 teleconf bet HNC/District similar to PDR
  - PDR lite template: record all items required in PDRS Checklist (e.g. LEED Checklist, FF&E validation and a Scope Table
  - COS reviews: clarify role; approval in PDRS vice e-mails/PAX
  - Chronic return of PDR for minor revisions

PDR/3086 recap….cont'd

- Items that need improvement
  - Changes to the 3086 by ACSIM should be made earlier in the process
  - ACF not realistic
  - IMCOM/Garrison/ACSIM/USACE communication
  - Timing of guidance
  - Timing of Code Releases (3x)
    - Earlier release of Code 1s and 3s
    - For NAU, issue Code 2s (DBB) vs 3s (streamlines design due to German Gov't's process)

PDR/3086 recap….cont'd

- Items that need improvement
  - Seemed like we had to repeat the same background history many weeks during phonecons; wasted time
  - Lost track of ongoing status after 3086's were submitted. Tracking of 3086 process at GD by PM element was virtually non-existent, even though discussions were ongoing between HNC and GD Cost Engineers.

PDR/3086 recap….cont'd

- Items that need improvement
  - Clear guidance on procedures, schedule/metrics, discrepancy between the PA and the DD1391.
  - Implementing ECB 2011-1
  - DDC costs are not accounted for in the PA
  - To ensure the projects meet the VM/E requirement, the VM/E funding amount needs to be identified as a separate line item and VM/E coverage should be addressed in the PDR and check list
  - Identify the extra fee for set aside disadvantaged contractors, either sole or small contractors in the PDR and captured in PA.

PDR/3086 recap…cont'd.

- Strategies employed that facilitated success
  - Weekly teleconferences promoted open dialogue between HQ, MSC and GD teams (3x)
  - Earlier Cost Engineering involvement (2x)
  - PDRS Wizard
  - HNC and CoS teams support to the GD
  - GD leaning forward to meet target suspense dates
  - IMCOM Site Approvals, Environmental clearances

PDR/3086 recap…cont'd.

- Strategies employed that facilitated success
  - Geographic District PDT meetings.
  - Getting the decision maker to the PDT meetings.
  - Having one "PDR Reviewer" for each project
  - Training
  - PDR/3086 status execution in monthly PRB's with senior district leadership

PDR/3086 recap…cont'd.

- Strategies employed that facilitated success
  - Regional support offered more flexibility to Districts
  - Early identification of project workload to determine AE or IH support requirements
  - Communication /Coordination
  - Having all Stakeholders present during PDR Workshop process

PDR/3086 recap…cont'd.

- Strategies employed that facilitated success
  - Single supervisor overseeing all project actions in District; maintained constant visibility and focused priority within LRL
  - A-E IDIQ Task Orders expedited PDR preparation, combined meetings to minimize impact to installation elements (DPW, unit, Env, Phys Sec, NEC, etc.)
  - Maintained constant coordination and communication among GD PM's, DPW Master Plans POC's, A-E's and Cost Engineers throughout entire process

Planning Charrettes - Summary

- Will OACSIM be releasing a list of projects requiring Planning Charrettes with funding this FY?
- Will the geographic districts have a choice to do them?
- Having an AE running the PC